

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/717,822	11/20/2000	Eron A. Jokipii	40914/DJS/Y62	2085	
23363	7590 10/31/2003		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP 350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD			EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR		
SUITE 500	OLOKADO BOULEVAKD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PASADENA	, CA 91105		2654		
			DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003	}	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/717,822**

Applicant(s)

JOKIPII

Examiner

Patrick N.Edouard

Art Unit 2654



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
Period 1	for Reply			
THE	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In		ı the	
- If the property - If NO property - If NO property - If NO property - If the proper	date of this communication. Deriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.	
Status	B			
1) 📙	Responsive to communication(s) filed on		·	
2a) ∐	This action is FINAL . 2b) This act			
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>1-33</u>	is/are pending in the app	lication.	
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from o	onsideration.	
5) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1-33	is/are rejected.		
7) 🗆				
8) 🗆	Claims		requirement.	
	tion Papers			
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) 🗀	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examin	er.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disapproved b	y the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	o this Office action.		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) 🗆	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:			
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.		
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No.	·	
	application from the International Bure		l	
🗀	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th			
14)∟ a) [Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic			
15)	The translation of the foreign language provisional Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic			
Attachm		priority direct 60 010.0. 35 120 dilujor 121.		
	tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
2) No	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
3) 💢 Inf	omation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4, 6	6) Other:		

Art Unit: 2654

5.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-33 are objected to because of the following informalities: as per claim 1, the word "and" on lines 8, 9 and "to" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1- 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White, III et al (6,493,661) in view of Atkin et al (6,490,547).

As per claim 1, White et al teach a system comprising:

"Wherein at least one of the plurality of computers comprises a conversion table (his text string database 13, col.2, lines 59-65, col. 3, lines 28-50, figure 3); the conversion table look up table comprising:

Application/Control Number: 09/717,822

Art Unit: 2654

· C

"A unique key value for each of a plurality of unique words of phrases" (figure 3, his identifier); and

"a language key for at least one language" (his language such French, English);

"A plurality of text phrases each corresponding to a language key and a unique key value" (his text string)

"Wherein the at least one of the plurality of computers further programmed "To receive a selection of a word or phrase" (his user 17, col. 3, lines 20-26);

"To convert the word or phrase into a unique key value using the conversion table" (figure 1, his specified language and text string identifier, col. 2, line 59 to col. 3, lines 7).

It is noted that White et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach a communication network connecting at least one of a plurality of network servers and at least one of plurality of computers" and " to transmit the unique key value to the network server".

However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Atkin et al who teach in figure 1, a data processing network 102 includes one or more servers 104-106 and one or more clients 108-110 wherein JILResourcebundle 210 transmits to the server and HTTP message for each user interface text string requiring translation an identification of the source code and identification of the target language at col. 4, lines 15-29. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate the system of White in a network environment as taught by Atkin because it would provide a localizing system that can

Art Unit: 2654

. • 4

provide support for a wide array of languages dynamically selected at run time and without the need for modification of the application.

As per claims 2-3 White et al teach wherein the conversion table comprises text phrases for only one language key (figure 3 and figure 1, his text string database 13).

As per claims 4-12, the combination of White with Atkin teaches the network server is programmed to receive the unique key value from the computer and transmits the unique key value to a second of the at least one of the computers computer (White's figures 1 and 3, his text string database in combination with the networking of Atkin et al figure 1).

As per claim 13, White et al teach wherein the network server comprises a server conversion table comprising a unique key, a language key and a plurality of text phrases (figure 1, his text string database 13, figure 3).

As per claims 14-18, the combination of White with Atkin teaches the network server is programmed to receive the unique key from the computer...(The White's computer as described in figure 1 and 3 in combination of Atkin's network in figure 1).

5. Claims 19-33 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-18 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2654

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hamann (6,092,036) is cited to teach a multi-lingual data processing system for translating text used in computer software utilizing an embedded translator.

Barnes et al (5,974,372) is cited to teach a graphical user interface language translator.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

Art Unit: 2654

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

October 24, 2003

PATRICK N. EDOUARD

PATENT EXAMINER